



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/633,001

08/01/2003

Walter Harvey Waddell

2003B079

8961

23455

7590

09/28/2006

EXXONMOBIL CHEMICAL COMPANY

5200 BAYWAY DRIVE

P.O. BOX 2149

BAYTOWN, TX 77522-2149

EXAMINER

RONESI, VICKEY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1714

DATE MAILED: 09/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/633,001	WADDELL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Vickey Ronesi	1714	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25,27-35,38-43 and 46-83 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25,27-35,38-43 and 46-83 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/13/2006 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

3. Claims 1-25, 27-35, 38-43, and 46-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dias et al (WO 02/48257 A2, cited on IDS dated 12/15/03).

The rejection is adequately set forth in paragraph 5 of Office action mailed 3/29/2006 and is incorporated here by reference.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 7/13/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically, applicant argues (A) that applicant is not required to present proper side-by-side examples because a comparison to the closest prior art has already been made; (B) that the data of the specification as originally filed is commensurate in scope with the claimed

Art Unit: 1714

invention; and (C) that Dias does not with sufficient specificity the presently claimed composition.

With respect to argument (A), examiner disagrees since proper side-by-side examples are necessary to establish the criticality of a particular component in a composition. If there are no proper side-by-side examples, a clear indication of the source of the alleged unexpected result cannot be made. In particular, the inventive data all contain carbon black in a total amount of 80 phr or greater, wherein the comparative only contain carbon black in an amount of 60 phr. Therefore, it is not possible to establish a criticality for the presently claimed carbon black when it could be the greater amount of carbon black which provides for improved air impermeability properties. Note that Tables 5 and 6 show that increased carbon black results in improved lower impermeability. Furthermore, applicant has not made a comparison to the closest prior art. Rather, applicant has merely compared (without proper side-by-side examples) the inventive composition to the exemplified composition of Dias et al. Case law hold that “applicant must look to the whole reference for what it teaches. Applicant cannot merely rely on the examples and argue that the reference did not teach others.” *In re Courtright*, 377 F.2d 647, 153 USPQ 735,739 (CCPA 1967).

With respect to argument (B), the examiner agrees that there are 3 types of carbon black used in the inventive data in the specification as originally filed. In particular, Regal 90 ( $N_2SA = 23 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$  and  $DBP = 33 \text{ cm}^3/100 \text{ g}$ ), Regal 90 ( $N_2SA = 23 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$  and  $DBP = 32 \text{ cm}^3/100 \text{ g}$ ), and N-990 ( $N_2SA = 7 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$  and  $DBP = 42 \text{ cm}^3/100 \text{ g}$ ) are exemplified. Nevertheless, these carbon blacks are not commensurate in scope with the claimed carbon black which has  $N_2SA < 30 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$  and  $DBP < 80 \text{ cm}^3/100 \text{ g}$ . Furthermore, only two types of polybutene oil (Parapol<sup>TM</sup> 1300 and 2400)

Art Unit: 1714

are exemplified which have Mn (1300 and 2350, respectively) and viscosity at 100°C (630 cSt and 3200 cSt, respectively) which are not commensurate in scope with the claimed polybutene oil of Mn > 400 and viscosity at 100°C of 10-6000 cSt. Case law holds that evidence of superior properties in one species insufficient to establish the nonobviousness of a subgenus containing hundreds of compounds). *In re Greenfield*, 571 F.2d 1185, 1189, 197 USPQ 227, 230 (CCPA 1978).

With respect to argument (C), while Dias et al fails to exemplify a composition containing carbon black in an amount greater than 60 phr or one having a surface area of less than 30 m<sup>2</sup>/g and a dibutylphthalate oil absorption of less than 80 cm<sup>3</sup>/100 gm as required in the present claims, this does not negate a finding of obviousness under 35 USC 103 since a preferred embodiment such as an example is not controlling. Rather, all disclosures “including unpreferred embodiments” must be considered. *In re Lamberti* 192 USPQ 278, 280 (CCPA 1976) citing *In re Mills* 176 USPQ 196 (CCPA 1972).

### *Conclusion*

5. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1714

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vickey Ronesi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2701. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on (571) 272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/633,001

Page 6

Art Unit: 1714

9/22/2006

Vickey Ronesi



*Vasu Jagannathan*  
VASU JAGANNATHAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700